

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

	TARIGHI et al.	Conf. 7931
Serial No.	09/987,915	Group Art Unit: 2611
Filed:	NOV. 16 2001	Examiner: Ghebretinsae
For:	PORTABLE WIRELESS COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS	

RESPONSE TO OFFICIAL ACTION / AMENDMENT &
REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is in response to the Office Action dated June 12, 2007. Applicant also Petitions for a Two-Month Extension of Time, extending the due date from Sept. 12 until Nov. 12, 2007.

Remarks

Claims 1-43 are pending, 1-17, 26-36 and 38-43 are withdrawn.

Claims 18 and 19 are rejected and 20-25 and 37 are objected to. Technical information and amendments are provided which are believed to overcome the Examiner's concerns. Claim 37 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter but because it is more properly grouped with Claim 1, withdrawn.

The specification is objected to as the abstract should not have the title. A replacement abstract page is provided herein to replace the prior page.

103 - Eberwine in view of Lunsford (Cl. 18), further in view of Cameron (Cl. 19)

In Figure 1 of Eberwine (see attached figures for comparison) it is clear that the controller CPU 204 is connected to the Modem and GPS via two separate serial ports.

The point of claim 18 is that PDA's have only one serial port (or USB or whatever) and at the same time they have to communicate data to multiple devices.

Our claim is that we cover a controller in the same device as the modem and internal GPS that makes it possible for the PDA (external) to communicate with all devices (modem,gps, any other device) via one shared port.

That is the operation of the switch.

If one were to implement Eberwine they would need multiple serial ports. This is a big distinction.

Reference to Lunsford is to a patent by Palm Inc. just re-enforces our claim that you have only ONE serial port to PDA to work with. So the examiner's point is not entirely understood in view of this technical information.

Further, to achieve functionality of the invention of claim 18, a person would have to use the teaching of Eberwine,, in which case they would have to add another serial port, which of course defeats the purpose since it adds both cost and real-estate to the PDA to have two or more serial ports. It also adds more power consumption. This is very important. This is what is avoided by SHARING the port. This is not in Eberwine.

Accordingly, even if the references could be combined as theorized, their combination would not achieve the claimed invention.

In view of this important technical distinction, applicant is reserving the chance to address Cameron at a later date should this technical information be insufficient.

Claims 20-25 have been re-written as independent claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and allow the claims and application as applicant believes all concerns have been satisfied. If the Examiner has any questions or wishes to discuss this matter, the Examiner is welcomed to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



JUNEAU PARTNERS, PLLC

P.O. Box 2516

Alexandria, VA 22301

Tel: (703) 548-3569

Todd L. Juneau

Reg. No. 40,669

Customer No. 50438